

### Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated October 28, 2004, indicated that claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rogers et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,379) in view of *Kishinsky et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,033).

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-44, Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103(a) rejection because the Office Action fails to present a combination of references that corresponds to the claimed invention. The cited '379 teachings are far removed from the present invention such that there are no issues of patentability relative thereto. To the extent that Section 103(a) has been raised in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the '379 reference has been misinterpreted.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no substantive relationship between the '379 and '033 references and the claimed invention and that a *prima facie* case of rejection has not been presented. A Section 103(a) *prima facie* rejection of a claim requires a proper presentation of evidence that would allege correspondence between the cited teachings (*e.g.*, from the cited references) and each limitation in the claims. However, in connection with the Section 103(a) rejection, only general assertions have been made and these assertions are based on citations to the '379 reference that are unrelated to the claimed invention. Instant claim 1, for example, is directed to a private branch exchange routing arrangement adapted to route IP telephony data. The '379 teachings with respect to the internet appear to be limited to conversion of voice data into standard analog telephone signals for use by standard switched telephone networks. *See, e.g.*, column 9, lines 58-63. The '379 reference does not appear to route any IP telephony data; rather, all communication with the telephones uses simple analog POTS (plain old telephone service) telephones. *See, e.g.*, column 15, lines 37-44. Furthermore, the Office Action has not shown how the '379 reference could function to route IP telephone data as claimed because the telephony signals to which the '379 reference is directed is limited to switched analog telephone signals.

Regarding the '033 reference, the cited portion of the reference broadly mentions object oriented programming (OOP) but fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, including a call-control application having an OOP telephony interface. The cited '033 reference appears limited to using OOP in connection with the implementation of CTI scripts for controlling switches, but fails to mention an OOP telephony interface as claimed. *See, e.g.*, column 2, lines 56-60.

Moreover, the Office Action cites the '379 reference, "Fig. 1, computer management system 99" and asserts that this corresponds specifically to the limitations of the "configuration manager . . ." clause of claim 1, without providing any citations to the '379 reference or further explanation of how the general '379 teachings correspond to Applicant's claimed limitations. Further, the '379 "Fig. 1, computer management system 99" appears to include everything in the lower half of Fig. 1 and "Fig. 1, computer management system 99" is referenced throughout the '379 reference as corresponding to a "business". *See, e.g.*, column 7, lines 60-63. Applicant fails to understand how the general teachings of the '379 reference correspond to the "configuration manager . . ." clause. Further, the claimed configuration manager is adapted to configure information for routing IP telephony data, which as discussed above, is not taught by the '379 reference. Thus, Applicant submits that the '379 teachings do not correspond to the claimed invention. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action further fails to show any correspondence to various dependent claims. With particular respect to claims 17 and 18, the Office Action acknowledges at page 4 that the '379 reference fails to teach the editing of configuration information. Regarding claims 30, 31, 43, 44, the Office Action acknowledges that the '379 reference fails to teach determining a relationship between a call source and destination. Regarding claim 37, the Office Action acknowledges that the '379 reference fails to teach assigning a telephone number to a selected IP telephony address. Without a showing of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 103(a) rejection cannot stand and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As each of the rejections is based on this apparent misinterpretation of the '379 and '033 references, the rejection of each of Applicant's pending claims should be removed.

In view of the above discussion, Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. A favorable response is requested. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (651) 686-6633.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
St. Paul, MN 55120  
651/686-6633

Dated: December 30, 2004

By: 

Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No. 32,122